

[Privacy/Security Notice](#)

[CHARTER](#) [MEMBERS](#) [WORKSHOPS](#) [RELATED LINKS](#)
[WHAT'S NEW](#)

**1999 Hanford Openness Workshop #1
Meeting Summary
February 10, 1999
Federal Building, Richland, WA.**

INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING BUSINESS

Michael Kern welcomed participants to the 1999 Hanford Openness Workshop (HOW) with a special welcome to several new participants. He went over the agenda and administrative details and asked participants and other attendees to introduce themselves. Max Power explained reimbursement policies to participants.

The group decided to wait until more participants were present to discuss the Spokesperson reappointment, charter and ground rules. Later in the workshop, participants reviewed the Consortium for Risk Evaluation with Stake Holder Participation's (CRESP) suggested revisions to the charter and approved them, after spending some time refining the mission and scope of issues.

During the spokesperson discussion, Mary Lou Blazek expressed concerns about remaining as Spokesperson unless other members of the HOW agreed to support her and HOW recommendations when they are presented in public forums. She was willing to remain as spokesperson if she received this support.

In the ground rules discussion, participants discussed and accepted the draft set of ground rules. Andy Gordon suggested placing the rules and all other HOW materials on the HOW home page. He challenged the HOW to model the type of information access they want DOE to prove and predicted that participants will discover more issues to discuss in the process. He suggested introducing an indexing strategy for documents. Max Power suggested adding a column to the agenda to track documents as the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) does and introducing a facilitator's annotated agenda.

Action Item: Place all documents relevant to the Hanford Openness Workshops on the Workshop's web site.

Action Item: CRESP to introduce an indexing strategy and document column on agendas.

DOE-RL UPDATE

Yvonne Sherman explained that the Department of Energy (DOE), Richland Operations Office (RL) Reading Room's online catalogue was in the process of adding links to online documents.

Action Item: Yvonne Sherman asked HOW participants to inform the DOE-RL Reading Room of any sites with the full text of documents they felt should be included in the online catalogue.

Yvonne Sherman announced she is working on DOE-RL management performance review process. She said she is working to introduce openness performance measures into this process and welcomes input.

Yvonne Sherman announced that she had arranged a conference call between HOW participants and Jim Werner, the Department of Energy Headquarters (DOE-HQ) contact for the database being developed as part of the NRDC et al vs. DOE settlement. Participants chose February 23, 1999 at 11a.m. Pacific Standard Time as the time which was most convenient to the largest number of people for this call.

Action Item: Yvonne Sherman and CRESP to inform all Hanford Openness Workshop participants of conference call-in number, date and time.

Yvonne Sherman announced that a two-video set of selected declassified nuclear weapons test films released by DOE in Nevada would be distributed to area libraries. She explained that this action is a direct result of HOW's interest in the videos during the 1998 workshops.

DISCUSSION OF DOE-RL RESPONSE TO THE 1998 HOW REPORT

Mary Lou Blazek said the HOW had not yet received a response from DOE-HQ regarding those recommendations in the 1998 HOW Report targeted at DOE-HQ. She wrote a letter on February 3, 1999 requesting a response and the name of a contact person at DOE-HQ.

Michael Kern distributed a handout entitled "Categorizing The DOE-RL Response to The HOW 1997-98 Report," which CRESP developed to help organize the HOW's discussion of the response. The handout groups DOE-RL's responses to the Report into several categories which include: 1) "We agree and are implementing /will implement," 2) "We believe this is already implemented," 3) "Please prioritize," 4) "Be more specific," and 5) "We disagree, because" In addition, several responses indicated that input from the HOW and/or the general public was invited, prompting a "When and How?" category. Finally, DOE-RL asked the HOW to keep track of positive and negative examples from which they can learn. Michael Kern noted that the call for positive and negative examples could be included the Progress Report to be developed at the end of this workshop series.

Action Item: Gather negative and positive examples for the Progress Report.

Michael Kern also noted the request to submit recommendations to DOE-RL as they arise and not wait for a final report. He suggested submitting requests to program managers as they come up, then collecting them at the end in the Progress Report.

Elaine Faustman suggested participants identify which responses they want to discuss with program managers in the afternoon. Andy Gordon suggested selecting a desired outcome to

give to the program managers later in the day and see if in six months it is accomplished. Michael Kern suggested that DOE-RL's request for prioritization of Recommendation 48 might be something to focus on.

Gerry Pollet expressed frustration that the DOE-RL cover letter again encouraged the HOW to be affiliated with the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB). He stated that since 1996, both the HOW and the HAB have disagreed with this view, and see good reasons to keep their efforts separate. Gerry Pollet also expressed disappointment in DOE-RL's response to the HOW's performance measures recommendations. DOE-RL said they would use the HOW's ideas in the fee award, but didn't. He said the most important recommendation was external input, yet there was no external input in the fee award. He expressed satisfaction that the HOW is meeting with the DOE-RL program managers and suggested inviting the Chief Financial Officer, the Assistant Manager and the Site Manager to upcoming workshops. The group agreed that these managers should be invited, as soon as their posts are filled.

Greg deBruler expressed concern that "openness is dying at Hanford," and that a lack of leadership was contributing to the problem. He said, although DOE-RL says they agree with the recommendations to eliminate retaliation, retaliation still exists. He pointed to Diane Larson and Sonya Anderson as examples.

Mary Lou Blazek said she could not find in the PEP any measures of openness under External Affairs, and wondered what that program was basing its openness fee on. Jim Trombold wondered how DOE assesses the quality of its external affairs. Dirk Dunning expressed concern that changes in public meeting policies have lead to fragmentation and loss of ideas. Yvonne Sherman suggested inviting Karen Randolph of the Office of External Affairs to answer these questions at a future workshop.

Action Item: Invite Karen Randolph to future workshop.

Q&A WITH DOE-RL PROGRAM MANAGERS

Michael Kern explained that the following short question and answer session DOE-RL program managers were intended to begin conversations that would continue at future workshops.

GAIL MCCLURE-PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Mary Lou Blazek asked Gail McClure about the response to recommendation eight, regarding evaluating public participation. Gail McClure explained that in the past year the DOE-RL Public Involvement Program has tried to implement more evaluations. Unfortunately, the public is not filling out the evaluation forms they set out at public meetings. She also explained that contractors do not do public involvement; rather, they support the DOE in doing public involvement.

Mary Lou Blazek noted that the DOE-RL Response said Gail McClure's program evaluates contractors based on criteria, yet the criteria are not described. Gail McClure responded that she writes what the contractors have done and turns that in. What she evaluates is the support she receives in doing public involvement. She does not ask for nor receive input from stakeholders in this process.

Mary Lou Blazek offered the help of the HOW in evaluating contractors. Gail McClure said she asks the HAB for input and requests quarterly evaluations from DOE-RL offices. She

noted that the DOE-RL offices provide the most feedback.

Gail McClure explained to Jim Trombold's question that she has received good ideas from the public. One questionnaire response asked why the public meetings were not announced in Walla Walla, and because of that query they now are.

Elaine Faustman suggested exit interviews and call backs as tools to use to augment the written evaluation forms and offered the help of the HOW to work with Gail McClure to suggest other methods of gathering public input.

Action Item: Participants suggest public input methods to Gail McClure.

Mary Lou stated that the evaluation in the past year was more comprehensive than ever before and a step forward. She told Gail McClure that the concern of the HOW is that John Wagoner thought these efforts met the need for adequate involvement yet it is clear they do not. She asked Gail McClure if the participants can continue to work with her. Gail McClure accepted the offer.

PAUL KRUGER-ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Paul Kruger said the HOW's activities complement his program's efforts to build language into contracts which improve the worker environment.

Diane Larson complimented Paul Kruger on an article in Sunday's paper. He explained that it was a letter to the editor correcting a statement in the press release for the FDH fee award which incorrectly credited integrated safety management reducing accidents by 50%. He said credit actually belongs to the work force.

Tom Carpenter stated that Fluor Daniel Hanford (FDH) recently laid off seven more pipefitters, demonstrating continuing reprisals and harassment. His organization complained directly to DOE-RL in letters and calls and did not get back much response. DOE-RL did not investigate to get to the bottom of the problem. People are afraid to speak in the safety meetings. The only message DOE is sending is in paying for Fluor Daniel's court costs and in trying to kill the Hanford Joint Council for Resolving Significant Employee Concerns.

Greg deBruler asked what Paul Kruger would do if he were "captain for a day." Paul Kruger responded that he would immediately modify the performance evaluation and implement stronger incentives contractually. He would apply more money directly to the implementation of safety conscious work and pull money away from violations. He would implement safety policies, some which are already in place, which would cause some suspensions and removals. Gerry Pollett noted that it sounded like Paul Kruger would implement the HOW's recommendations if he were "captain."

Paul Kruger suggested that the HOW, like the HAB, needs to balance the goal of meeting milestones and commitments with keeping workers safe. Gerry Pollett stated that the HOW 1998 Report recommendation to assign a five to six percent performance measure fee award on openness is a balance and that it has been rejected. He asked Paul Kruger to identify the obstacle preventing DOE from adopting the performance measures recommendations. Paul Kruger stated he is only one member of the management team with direct control over only the evaluation of the performance of Bob Shultz, the Vice President of Environmental Safety and Health for FDH. This is a small amount of the fee pool, but significant enough to

drive change. He suggested the HOW make specific comments concerning where to allot money, and how to meet milestones at the same time.

Gerry Pollet said last year the recommendation to incorporate external input into the PEP, was rejected, but John Wagoner wrote back to the HOW that the recommendations would be incorporated into the fee award. Gerry Pollet asked Paul Kruger if there was any external input in the evaluation. Paul Kruger responded that there is not a formal process for regular input, but he has applied an informal process for input about emergency preparedness from the HAB.

Jim Trombold noted that in the current scenario, someone is embarrassed when a "whistle is blown" and there is retaliation. He suggested creating a team emphasis, with the whistleblower and the potential retaliator each part of a team that is rewarded as a group for facing and addressing problems. Paul Kruger said this is similar to the recommendation of a group which recently evaluated the current system and recommended rewarding workers who raised issues and successfully implemented the idea through a presentation from the President of Fluor Daniel. The goal is culture change. The Environmental Safety and Health program accepted the recommendation and is exploring how to apply it through existing safety committees.

Paul noted he returns phone calls and emails promptly and agreed to be added to the participant contact list.

Action Item: Add program managers to Contact List.

JIM BAUER-EMPLOYEE CONCERNS

Jim Bauer said the Hanford Openness Workshop recommendations have caused his program to do a lot of thinking about how to create the desired culture change. On Feb. 1, they published a revised employee concerns order, which he distributed. He explained the Employee Concerns Program is one part of the program he is the manager of called Concern Resolution and Quality Resources. Jennifer Sands is the manager for Employee Concerns.

Action Item: Invite Jennifer Sands to a future workshop?

Tom Carpenter stated that when his organization went to Hanford in 1988, the companies said they would not tolerate reprisal. Since then, dozens of people have lost jobs, with massive legal battles following. He asked for suggestions on how to move from the statement "zero tolerance" to the reality. He said Hanford never admits that a specific manager did the wrong thing. Diane Larson noted that the manager who was over her before she was involuntarily laid off still has his job. She stated that because it isn't handled at that level, it goes to litigation. Nothing ever happens to the manager.

Jim Bauer replied, to Gerry Pollet's question, that there is no formal evaluation of reprisals that results in an impact on fee awards. Gerry Pollet stated that the only reductions in contractor fees are if they can't meet a milestone. Jim Bauer agreed with Gerry Pollet that things need to be changed and what is needed is balancing. Gerry Pollet expressed frustration that there isn't a positive fee for mediating and resolving a dispute before litigation or any mention of legal violations and issues over retaliation.

Andy Gordon said he would love to see a statistic where someone has retaliated and there

has been a conviction against reprisal. He asked for a suggestion of a deliverable that doesn't require the whole culture to turn around.

Paul Kruger interjected that he is aware of suspensions and transferals and he will try to generate statistics which preserve privacy. He said he would report these to the HOW, or explain his plan for finding them. He also asked the participants for input on the PEP.

Deliverable: Paul Kruger and Jim Bauer deliver statistics on suspensions and transferals of retaliators to Hanford Openness Workshop.

Greg deBruler asked where the process of transmitting recommendations to DOE breaks down. He asked how to make an institutional change. In response, Jim Bauer asked participants for a deliverable he could work on which would show progress. He stated the nuclear industry is struggling to show progress and he reflected that it is "difficult to turn an aircraft carrier," but that is what they are trying to do.

Greg deBruler suggested taking five people from Tom Carpenter's list and tracking down their stories to see where the system broke down. Jim Bauer agreed that Tom Carpenter can point to 10-15 examples where the system has broken down, but through his resources he can point to up to 100 examples where it did not break down. He agreed that he could do better discovering where the system breaks down.

Jim Trombold asked what percentage of employees who enter Jim Bauer's office to talk about on-the-job safety do not go to court. Jim Bauer responded 95%. The cases that do not get resolved are very difficult cases.

Gerry Pollet suggested talking at a later workshop about some of HOW recommendations that have been rejected. Jim Bauer agreed, and said that when people correspond in writing, they often lose information in the process. He welcomes a chance to speak with participants again. Andy Gordon suggested that both participants and managers return with suggestions for "deliverables" or tangible, incremental outcomes that could be achieved this year. Jim said he welcomed phone calls and would like to work on this between meetings with HOW participants.

KEVIN CLARKE-TRIBAL NATIONS

Kevin Clarke introduced his staff: Dan Tano and Mary Kay Edwards.

Nanci Peters expressed frustration in the changes she observed in managers' behavior toward her when she moved from working with Kevin Clarke to working for the Yakama Nation. Managers won't work with the Tribe, yet they tell Kevin Clarke they are, or they say they prefer working through Kevin Clarke and not directly with the Tribe. Kevin's office is positive and responds quickly, but there is not consistent respect among the managers. People in the hall at DOE-RL call her a "traitor" for working for the Tribe.

Kevin Clarke expressed concern over Nanci Peters' experiences. He described an upcoming program called Tribal Lifeways which may help. He said he is looking forward to the June 2 Hanford Openness Workshop on Tribal Concerns. DOE is revamping its American Indian Policy, which will be presented to the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) at an upcoming meeting. In response to Michael Kern's query, Kevin Clarke agreed to bring the new policy to the workshop on June 2 and to provide a speaker on the topic, if desired

Greg deBruler asked about page 17 of DOE-RL Response, where DOE says it cannot delegate responsibility for compliance with tribal treaty and trust obligations to its contractors. He wondered how contractors will know about their responsibility to the tribes if DOE does not teach them. He wondered why asking contractors to comply with treaties is any different than asking them to comply with other laws, which DOE routinely does.

Kevin Clarke explained that in this response DOE was saying it can't abdicate its responsibility and often tribal officials don't want to deal with contractors, but rather the highest official, government-to-government. He agreed with Greg deBruler that DOE has to let contractor know about treaty obligations. He said there has been disagreements between interpretations of treaty wording.

Greg deBruler described the difficulties he experienced trying to get Batelle to include tribes in scenario writing and to create scenarios that were more than white-based. He felt the problem arose because DOE was not willing to take a strong position in recognizing tribal rights. He also expressed concern over dwindling tribal involvement in the HAB. He suggested two reason: 1) the Tribes, acting as sovereign nations, work directly with DOE; 2) the HAB has never had a presentation about the Tribes, where they are, who they are, and the responsibility toward them. He stated that it is the responsibility of the HOW to lay these issue out for everyone and to give Kevin Clarke the support he needs so he can educate as well.

Kevin Clarke asked for comments emailed to him about the program summary and the goals listed in the DOE/Indian Nations Home Page.

Action Item: Participants email Kevin Clarke their comments on the DOE/Indian Nations Home Page's program summary and goals:
<http://www.em.doe.gov/em22/tribindx.html>

Dirk Dunning suggested that though DOE could not relinquish its duties, the requirements could be pushed down to the contractors. He also compared the DOE Indian Policy with the National Environmental Policy Act because the sweeping language of each is broad as to create accountability in specific situations.

Nanci Peters stated that Russell Jim has never expressed difficulties with participating in the HAB. She explained that when the Yakama withdraw from the HAB, they want an intense, one-on-one dialogue with DOE. They are demonstrating their sovereignty.

Jim Trombold warned HOW participants not to think of the Indian Nations as just another stakeholder. He said it is easy to point fingers at DOE for their interaction with the Tribes, but most non-Indian groups are just as culpable in their failure to work with Tribes correctly. They are independent nations.

Michael Kern said that a steering committee will be assembled to work on the Tribal Hanford Openness Workshop and that Kevin Clarke will be invited to attend.

HOW participants thanked the program managers for meeting with them. Yvonne Sherman said the managers would contact the HOW spokesperson when they were working on something in interest to the HOW. She added that Rick Stutheit asked for more information from the HOW to complete recommendation #29. He listed all the keywords he could

brainstorm in the response and requested that any additional ones be emailed or mailed to him, by 3/15/99.

Action Items: Participants email or mail additional key words to Rick Stutheit by 3/15/99.

PLANNING FOR 1999 HOW WORKSHOPS

Greg deBruler noted that the workshop's comments and discussion generated work: discovering where DOE needs guidance. He expressed confusion over how the workshop addressed the response and how the day's efforts led to the next workshop's topic of an open and transparent decision making process. He noted the participants started a conversation about open and transparent decision making when they asked the managers questions and discovered how they actually made decisions and suggested continuing that conversation. He suggested developing criteria for evaluating public involvement.

Elaine Faustman noted that at the 1998 HOW#1 participants broke in to working groups on different topics. She suggested the first organizational issue was to have people select which groups they want to continue working with. The groups could follow up on these conversations with the managers, clarify where they agree and disagree with the response to the report, and identify action items. She also suggested the managers bring back an outline or a diagram indicating how they make their decisions, for example how they prioritize funding or action. She suggested the participants break into groups to work on these issues by conference call to prepare for the next workshop.

Mary Lou expressed concern that the participants are trying to do too much this year. She noted Dirk Dunning had outlined some ideas. Dirk Dunning said the topics included: Declassification, Contract/Fees/PEP; Information Technologies; Retaliation, Public Involvement and Budget. He said the topics split easily into the topics of the two upcoming workshops. He noted this year the HOW faces a new issue, expanding openness and transparent decision making and implementation and expressed concern that its not yet clear how the participants are going to address Implementation and Public Involvement.

Yvonne Sherman expressed concern that last year, it was very difficult to obtain between-meeting participation. She also stated that participants need to focus and prioritize, because they can't address all 51 recommendations in just five workshops.

Greg deBruler said implementation fits into all categories, because that's the bottom line. He suggested focusing in, and suggested four topics: Worker Retaliation, Document Access, Contract Issues, and Public Involvement. He suggested participants develop criteria for each and then work with the appropriate DOE-RL managers and their departments. He expressed concern that the group doesn't see the problem clearly enough yet to see what's missing, so it can't see how to help the managers. He also suggested approaching Tom Carpenter's sources, listening to Tom Carpenter and acquiring a clearer picture of what is going wrong with the manager retaliation system before we can go back to the managers

Elaine Faustman suggested the managers return for the next two workshops and that the participants hold conference calls to prepare.

Michael Kern said he heard participants say that they would like as much time as possible for continuing discussion with the program managers, determining the things they would like

to accomplish together, and then getting these things done.

Deirdre Grace said she observed both HOW participants and DOE-RL managers yearning for a chance to sit down together, brainstorm, and hash out ideas. She suggested the managers return on the first day of the next workshop. She suggested inviting "higher ups" the second day to hear a report of the first day.

Michael Kern, Elaine Faustman and Jim Trombold all suggested that participants meet with higher ups at the fifth workshop and focus on setting and achieving goals at the second and third workshops.

Jim Trombold suggested spending the second workshop refining the ideas of the participants and then speaking with the managers the third workshop.

Michael Kern said it sound like participants want an open-ended discussion with the managers at the next HOW. He suggested there be a networked computer there and everyone bring what they think they might need.

Elaine Faustman suggested that the next workshop will need break-out sessions with program managers. She also suggested inviting professionals who help organizations develop performance metrics to present and then answer questions. She also suggested expanding the discussion to include an aggressive campaign to reach out and communicate what the workshops have accomplished. This idea received much agreement.

Greg deBruler noted the participants have already developed a good product in last year's report and now they need a larger audience. He also expanded on several areas he felt the HOW should focus on:

Worker retaliation: Zero tolerance is the policy, but there is no implementation. We need to create a tool for them that is clear and definitive: "If we were a captain of the ship, this is how we would run it."

Site Wide Openness Policy Implementation: Create an implementation process on openness and a review process to see how its being done. There really is no external review process, it isn't working or it isn't being implemented. We can work on and develop something, because they don't have criteria.

Declassification/Access to Documents: We need to fine tune guidance on that with more specifics. We have an expert here in Andrew Gordon who can probably pull things together and say, "These are tools you can use." We need to get some definitive tools and say, "Here, stop stumbling in the dark."

Transparency and Understanding the Decision Process and Input Points for Involvement: We need to understand this process, where these input points are, and how we can be part of that process. "We know after 10 years of being here that we don't know."

Meeting with the New Manager: This should take place earlier, rather than later. We also need someone high up from HQ who can report back what we are doing.

Andy Gordon suggested participants establish aggressive short-range agenda to see that they

are making progress. He said sometimes public access committees are used as an excuse for not giving true public access. He also warned that another convenient excuse is being leaderless, like DOE-RL is now. He asked, "What can be accomplished by the end of this workshop series?"

Jim Trombold suggested participants meet with the DOE contact on the Fast Flux Test Facility in a conference call. He also suggested participants give input to Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson and others at DOE-HQ about the new DOE-RL Site Manager decision. He also suggested a sub-group of the participants meet with the new site manager before the April workshops. Greg deBruler agreed and suggested interfacing with Lloyd Piper, the current assistant manager in Richland, to communicate what the HOW participants are trying to do.

Action Item: Invite Lloyd Piper to an upcoming workshop.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Richard Buck of the Wanapum Band and employee of the Nez Perce Tribe addressed the HOW. He said he wished to speak as an individual, not representing any organization. He explained that he has spent his entire life working on tribal cultural resource issues in the area surrounding the Hanford nuclear site. He said he has seen many groups like the HOW come and go and now wonders if every new group will be here for a while then gone and without accomplishing what it set out to do. He challenged participants to think very carefully about what they are doing and how they are trying to get it done. He said to be very careful that they are not just DOE's pacification group for the public on openness. He asked why there was no Wanapum representative on the HOW.

DISCUSSION OF TRIBAL ISSUES AND WORKSHOP #4; WRAP UP

Elaine Faustman expressed gratitude to Richard Buck for so eloquently redefining what full openness means, including issues of religious freedom.

Jim Trombold wondered if the tribes should eschew a tribal workshop and meet directly with the new site manager. Russell Jim stated that the Yakama Nation sent word to DOE-HQ requesting that the new manager know something about tribes. He stated there are seven federally recognized tribes affected by Hanford, up to nine Indian groups in total.

Michael Kern stated that the HOW has intended Workshop #4 to be a platform for the tribes to raise whatever openness concerns they see fit. He said he would work with tribal representatives to put together an agenda they feel is valuable.

Russell Jim stated he would like to continue the education process. He said the dilemma the tribes are in is that their foods and medicines have been adversely affected by DOE decisions and actions. However, it takes a scientist who understands cultural issues like use and seasonal harvest, to find the classified documents needed to answer tribal questions. It takes money to staff those scientists. Michael Kern noted that this is one of the messages the tribal workshop will want to communicate.

Greg deBruler stated that the 1998 HOW Report is missing a full tribal perspective. He said the benefit of the Tribal Workshop is gaining that perspective. He also stated that the HOW can listen to the Tribes and communicate as a united front; hopefully there will be an audience. He said he encourages this to go forward.

The participants invited Kevin Clarke to participate in the Tribal Workshop and he accepted. Michael Kern suggested CRESF set up a conference call with Angel McCormack, Nanci Peters, Russell Jim, Kevin Clarke and others to plan the tribal workshop.

Yvonne Sherman said she is clear about Workshop #4, but expressed concern about the plans for Workshop #2 and #3.

Elaine stated that the working groups needed to prioritize and establish clear action items.

Mary Lou Blazek recommended that the next two workshops move to Richland. She stated it is more important to have access to DOE-RL and the program managers than to have a workshop in Seattle. The participants agreed to move the April workshops to Richland.

Action Item: Publicize the change of venue for HOW #2, #3 to Richland

Michael Kern suggested inviting the managers and possibly others for an interactive discussion the second day of the next workshop. He also suggested breaking into small groups the second day.

Greg deBruler expressed concern that participants needed to refine what their deliverables and goals are.

Mary Lou Blazek suggested using both days to talk with DOE managers and overcome road blocks in implementing HOW recommendations. She also suggested breaking into groups like those Greg deBruler or Dirk Dunning recommended. Dirk expressed concern that the Implementation and Public Involvement pieces on his list fit better under Workshop #3. Elaine replied that the pieces can be worked with, moved around and grouped by topics.

Elaine used declassification as an example and suggested there could be a declassification group working with declassification managers to prioritize recommendations, which they bring back to the larger group. Elaine suggested break-out sessions to pare down the recommendations.

Greg deBruler expressed concern that if the managers speak with just break out groups, the greater whole will lose those threads. He suggested having a discussion as a whole group and then breaking out to discuss what to work on and develop. Elaine Faustman suggested meeting in small groups at first and then meeting with everybody. Elaine Faustman reminded participants that last year, the actual work happened in small groups. She pointed to the performance measures recommendation as an example.

She also suggested the participants work with one set of two managers in the morning and a different set of two managers in the afternoon. For each half day, the participants could spend an hour and a half in break out sessions to work out issues together with some time to report back to the group what they've done.

Jim Trombold expressed concern that participants need between-meeting conference calls or a buffer of the first half day to themselves to prepare. He suggested beginning the meeting with the managers in the afternoon of the first day.

Greg suggested building on the report and response from last year and noted there is a lot of

work there. He said the dialogue with the managers has just started. He suggested the participants concentrate on why DOE doesn't use the HOW's advice.

Mary Lou expressed agreement with Elaine that it is difficult to reach conclusions as a big group. She suggested participants hand-off concerns to someone else in a working group they are not able to attend.

Elaine Faustman suggested the small groups meet with the managers first so the topic is worked over some before the group gets together. She suggested the managers be there for the presentation to the whole group to answer questions. She also asked participants to work with CRESP between workshops. She noted that CRESP has had difficulty getting calls returned and therefore isn't able to accomplish as much as it could with better between-meeting involvement from participants.

Action Item: CRESP to create a synthesis of ideas for HOW # 2 and 3 and propose to HOW participants as draft agendas.

Gerry Pollet asked participants to follow through with the managers on contract performance measures. He said the performance measures concerns fit under more than one topic, including worker retaliation and public involvement, and could be discussed in each working group.

Andy Gordon expressed concern that the current five topics won't quite work because the managers fit several different categories. He also suggested asking the managers to prepare for the specific questions left on the table.

Deirdre Grace challenged the participants to think beyond what they did last year, to go beyond the traditional channels, and to decide what deliverables to give to the public.

Hanford Home Page | Openness | Workshop Summary Index

For questions or comments about this page, please send email to Yvonne_T_Sherman@ri.gov
URL: <http://www.hanford.gov/boards/openness/summary/021099.htm>

Last Updated: 08/04/2003 14:50:28

